



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Marcomani, and other German tribes) in one uninterrupted chain of events caused by a barren and uninhabitable home, which induced these people to wander forth in search of a milder climate and more fertile lands. Some links in his chain of evidence are doubtful, and his proofs may meet with opposition among specialists. But we leave all corrections and opposition to his opinion to such, and will briefly sum up the results of the book.

According to Müllenhoff, the ancient boundary of Germany was, then, the Vistula on the east, and a line passing through the Carpathian Mountains to the sharp bend of the Danube at Cripi (modern Waitzen). The southern boundary was the Danube, and the western the Rhine.

When we examine carefully the conclusions here reached in regard to the direction of the three Keltic expeditions, the invasion of the Kimbri and Teutons, the movements of the Chatti and Marcomani and other German tribes, we can see much confirmatory evidence for the school of Wilser and others (*Die Herkunft der Deutschen*) who advocate a Scandinavian home for the race. We find no confirmation in history that the different nations wandered from the east to the western and northwestern coasts of Europe, and then, repelled by the ocean and the barren soil, recoiled to the south and east again. But the veil which shrouds the earliest movements of these nations will never be lifted, and we can only give the Scotch verdict of "not proven" for either an Asiatic or Scandinavian home of the race.

The present volume only brings us down to the beginning of that long struggle between the Germans and the Roman Empire which finally resulted in the overthrow of the latter. It is regrettable that Professor Müllenhoff could not have lived long enough to have completed his work. But we hope that Dr. Roediger will soon give us the fragments still left on this very interesting stage in the development of the Germans. As far as it is possible to determine the master's plan, the third volume will treat of the wars with Rome; the fifth, of German mythology; the sixth and last, of the development and history of the German epics, leaving the national development for the fourth. Magazine articles and different essays left by the author will furnish material for carrying out the general plan of the work, which will certainly be a monument of erudition and untiring research.

SYLVESTER PRIMER.

Sophocles. *The Plays and Fragments. Part III, the Antigone.* With critical notes, commentary, and translation into English prose by R. C. JEBB. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1888.

In the brief space of five years, Professor Jebb has edited three parts of his complete edition of Sophocles, which embraces, besides a commentary, notes on textual criticism, introductions and appendices, also an English prose version of the Greek dramatist. It is the purpose of this notice briefly to review the part latest issued, the *Antigone*. The editor's object throughout the entire work, as stated in the preface of the first edition of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, is to present the work of Sophocles "both in its larger aspects and at every particular point" as it appears to his mind, free from ambiguity and in a form appreciable not only to classical students, but

also, in part at least, to educated readers. The translation, which faces the Greek text page for page, is made with the greatest possible fidelity to the original—which is very different from bald literalism as well as from poetic paraphrase—and is to be the means, it is hoped, of inducing students of literature to read a play of Sophocles as they would read a great poem of a modern poet. The twofold aim, then, of this great edition is first to furnish the classical student with all the apparatus essential to a thorough and critical appreciation of the Greek dramatist, and secondly, to give the non-classical student the interpretation of the work of a master-poet at the hands of a competent critic, and by such an interpretation to stimulate him to seek a *first-hand* knowledge of the poet.

How much stimulus to direct study of the text a thoroughly faithful version will produce, is a question that admits of different answers. Independently of this, however, the aim to present a Greek poem before an English reader simply as a masterpiece of literature, with as much of the original form and aroma upon it as can be saved in the process of translating, is itself a worthy one, and one quite distinct from an ordinary version. That Professor Jebb has succeeded in doing this to a remarkable degree, both by his illustrative material and by his discussions of interpretations, as well as by his felicitous and exact renderings, no one will be disposed to question. As instances of especially happy rendering, we single out the following: V. 68, "For 'tis witless to be over-busy"; v. 263, *ἔφηνε μὴ εἰδέναι*, "pleaded in defense that he knew nothing of it." So in the notes. Here the pregnant and legal sense of *ἔφηνε* is better reproduced than in the translation given in the body of the text.—V. 318, "And why wouldst thou define the seat of my pain?"—Vv. 590 f. "And there is a sullen roar from wind-vexed headlands that front the blows of the storm."—V. 816, "Whom the lord of the Dark Lake shall wed." Not so good is "denounce" for *κατεῖδα* (86), which here means "declare"; nor "with a crash" for *ἀντιπῶπα* (134), which is rather "with a rebound."

An examination of the critical apparatus shows how carefully the editor has brought everything that promised the least aid under contribution. In the *Antigone* he has consulted the modern Greek editions of Pallis (Athens, 1885), and of Semitelos (Athens, 1887), and at first blush with apparently meagre results. But results in textual emendation are not to be measured by the gross nor weighed in hay-scales. In their order we shall notice the improved readings, some of which prove the wisdom of the rule, *non multa sed multum*. The temper in which Prof. Jebb treats the text of Sophocles is best stated in his own words in the introduction to the O. T., pp. lviii: "All students of Sophocles would probably agree at least in this, that his text is one in which conjectural emendation should be admitted only with the utmost caution. His style is not seldom analogous to that of Vergil in this respect, that when his instinct felt a phrase to be truly and finely expressive, he left the logical analysis of it to the discretion of grammarians then unborn. Such a style may easily provoke the hand of prosaic correction; and if it requires sympathy to interpret and defend it, it also requires, when it has once been marred, a very tender and very temperate touch in any attempt to restore it." . . . "Instances have not been wanting in

which, as I venture to think, editors of Sophocles have inclined too much to the side of unnecessary or even disastrous alteration. On the other hand, it is also a serious fault to place our manuscripts above the genius of the ancient language and of the author, and to defend the indefensible by 'construing,' as the phrase is, 'through thick and thin.' Comparing the three plays already edited, we observe more conservatism in the treatment of the text in the later than in the earlier part of the work. In the O. T. the editor places nine emendations of his own in the text and suggests five others in the notes. In the O. C. the number of emendations made by the editor in the text is six, transpositions three, emendations suggested in the notes ten. In the Ant. the editor admits only five emendations of his own, and prefers in his notes two or three readings which he does not adopt in the text. But perhaps a truer criterion of an editor's attitude towards a traditional text is the favor with which he looks upon emendations of others. Here again Prof. Jebb has been more ready to admit conjectures in the text of the earlier than in that of the later of the plays he has edited. Of course, our reckoning is a proportional one. In the O. T. we count 59 or 60 emendations adopted from others; in the O. C. 52, in the Ant. 41. This increasing deference towards the MS. reading may perhaps be in part attributed to the use Prof. Jebb has made of the autotype facsimile of L, which was not available for the editing of the O. T. We are inclined to think that in a few instances he has been unduly influenced by the mere resemblance of words and letters in constituting his text, and that the *ductus litterarum* has been too strong a motive. As such an instance we regard his reading in vv. 23-24, *σὺν δίκῃς χρήσει δικαία*. The difficulties of the traditional text are, we think, equalled by such usage as *σὺν χρήσει* and *δικαία χρήσις δίκης*. We cannot help regretting that the editor has defended the senseless *οὐτ' ἄτης ἄτερ*, verse 2. Starting from the assumption—not well supported—that the hypothesis of a marginal gloss is unwarranted, he defends the traditional text on one of two grounds: either as a case of confusion of negatives, or as concealing a corruption. While preferring on the whole the former alternative, he proceeds to show how, on the supposition that *οὐτ' ἄτης ἄτερ* arose after the text had been brought to Alexandria by Ptolemy Euergetes, the Ptolemaic writing would explain the origin of *ἄτης ἄτερ* from *ἄτης πέρ(α)* or *ἄτην περὼν*, or *ἄλᾶστορον*, either of which would make sense.—V. 10. The interpretation of Jebb commends itself: "Evils belonging to (proper for) our enemies are coming upon our friends; *ἰ. ε.* that our brother Polynices is to share the doom of the Argive dead by being left unburied."—V. 56. *αὐτοκτονοῦντε* is needlessly interpreted in the notes by "slaying with their own hands"; the translation gives the true sense: "each slaying the other."—V. 106. The reading *Ἀργόθεν ἐκβάντα φῶτα* is a simple and sensible remedy of the traditional text.—Vv. 125-126. The interpretation turns upon the question whether *δράκων* is to be understood of the Thebans or the Argives. Jebb argues for the former and changes *δράκοντι* to *δράκοντος*. We agree that in the use of *δυσχείρωμα* the poet does not wish to say that the Thebans won with difficulty, but that the Theban *πάταγος Ἄρεος* was a thing which the Argives could not overcome, and we incline to hold fast to the reading *δράκοντι* in appos. with *ἀντιπάλῳ*, and referring to the *Argives*.—

V. 208. The change of *τιμήν* to *τιμῇ*, adopted from Pallis, is morally and palaeographically certain.—V. 320. The superiority of *λάλημα* over *ἀλημα* is justly pointed out.—V. 350. Jebb reads *ὀχμάζεται ἀμφὶ λόφον ζυγῶν* after Schöne and Donaldson. Thus he gets rid of the troublesome future in *ἔζεται*, or *ἄζεται*, or *ὑπάζεται*. But why not admit here a kind of modal future similar to *ἐπάζεται* in v. 361?—V. 370. Few will follow our editor, we fancy, in his interpretation of *ὑψίπολις* = *ὑψηλὴν πόλιν ἔχων*, by which an awkward change of subject in the next sentence is required, and the antithesis between *ὑψίπολις* and *ἀπολις* is marred.—V. 436. The change of *ἀλλ'* of the MSS to *ἄμ'* is "certain."—V. 452. Jebb falls into line with many recent editors in adopting Dindorf's emendation, *τοιούσδ' ὥρισεν*.—V. 467. The emendation of Semitelos, *ῥσχυναν κύνας* is adopted. But *αἰσχύνω τινά* is not on a parallel with the passage quoted (Il. 22, 74): *πολίον κάρη πολίον τε γένειον . . . αἰσχύνωσι κύνας*. As a matter of palaeography, this emendation seems more defensible than as a form of expression.—V. 487. In the note on *Ζεὺς ἔρκειος* we have a good instance of the ample learning that enriches this edition.—Vv. 506–507. The genuineness of these verses is defended without noticing the objection that in 508 ff. not the slightest allusion is made to this general sentiment, but Creon's reply directly refers to 504–505.—V. 519. Jebb defends *τούτους* against most editors who read *ἴσους*, which the Schol. gives as a variant. *τούτους* can have no deictic force here. The readings *ἴσους* and *ἴσος* in the next verse look back to *ἐξ ἴσων* in 516 and give a Sophoclean edge to the colloquy.—V. 551. *εἰ γελῶ γ'* for the traditional *εἰ γέλωτ'* is a clear gain.—V. 606 f. Hermann's emendation, *οὔτε θεῶν ἀκμητοὶ* (changed to *ἀκματοὶ*) is adopted. The argument for *θεῶν μῆνες* is more ingenious than convincing, and the true reading is, we think, still to be found.—V. 613. *πάμπολύν γ'*, Heath's emendation for *πάμπολις*, Jebb regards as certain. But this is the only known instance of the substantive use of this compound. Besides, this word does not harmonize with the main idea of the ode, which is the *ἄτη* that follows upon transgression (*ὑπερβασία*), not that which comes from the *φθόνος θεῶν* with respect to anything that is "vast,"—V. 637. *ἀξιώσεται* for *ἀξίων ἔσται* is self-evident, especially when, as the editor points out, the change was probably due to the fact that *ἀξιωθήσεται* was the fut. form in ordinary use.—V. 685. To take *μή* after *ὅπως* as *generic* is better than to explain it as a substitute for *οὐ* through the influence of the optatives.—V. 782. The interpretation of *ἐν κτήμασι πίπτεις* by "who fallst upon (men's) possessions" seems to us prosaic. The entire ode is full of personality. Love couches upon the cheek of the maiden, he travels afar, neither mortal nor immortal can flee his power. To say it falls upon possessions is not the same thing as to say it falls upon men so as to make them reckless of possessions.—V. 797. *ὥστε πέρα δρᾶν* is a noteworthy emendation by Semitelos for *πάρεδρος ἐν ἀρχαῖς*, suggested but not adopted by Jebb. Not only does this change seem plausible as a matter of *literal* substitution, but it helps greatly both sense and metre.—V. 838. This awkward verse is defended. To the objection that in life, *ζῶσαν*, no resemblance between Antigone and Niobe can be drawn, Jebb replies: "in life and not only in death, because Niobe, like Antigone, was in the fulness of her vitality when she met her doom." That is, they were alike

in *life* because they both *died* young. But is not that being alike in their *dying*?—Vv. 904–920. We are glad that our editor brackets this famous passage. The discussion in the Appendix contains nothing new; but that was hardly to be expected. Jebb is perfectly right in saying that the only line of defence of which the passage is capable is that made by Bellermann.—Vv. 935 f. The editor remarks: “Said by Creon, clearly—not by the Chorus.” Most editors, however, hold the opposite view.—V. 1073. A good point is made on βιάζοντα as better suited to express a positive than a negative wrong, and as therefore requiring for its subject οἱ ἄνθρωποι.—Vv. 1080–1083. The treatment of this difficult passage is not so full as could be desired. If the reading must stand, Jebb’s interpretation is perhaps the most acceptable that has been proposed.—V. 1090. ἡ of the MSS is retained. We are not sure that we quite understand the note upon it. In the translation τῶν φρενῶν is taken in its physical sense as indicating the *seat* of the νοῦς (“to bear within his breast a better mind”), but in the notes the phrase τὸν νοῦν τῶν φρενῶν seems to be taken in the sense of “the mind of the heart,” as though φρήν expressed the spiritual or moral nature.—V. 1102. δοκεῖ for δοκεῖς is undoubtedly right.—V. 1119. The traditional Ἰταλίαν is retained. The chief reason urged against Ἰκαρίαν is that this name is celebrated, κλυτάν, only as a *myth*; what we want is a famous *region*, “one worthy to be linked with Eleusis.” This note was written before the valuable discoveries at Sto Dionysio in Attica, made by the American School at Athens last year, settled the location of Icaria beyond dispute, and proved it to be at one time a region no less celebrated than Eleusis.—V. 1128. The Parnassian (Corycian) cave is not “high up on the mountain,” but is situated near the top of a hill which rises from the plain or table-land that lies at the base of Mt. Parnassus.—V. 1232. In spite of Jebb’s assertion “that nothing could do more violence to the dramatic effect than the Scholiast’s theory that πτόσις προσώπῳ has a merely figurative sense,” we cannot bring ourselves to believe that in this scene of extreme anguish of mind the poet would have us understand that Haemon actually spat in his father’s face. We have no reason to suppose that such an act had with the Greeks any more dignity or less repulsiveness than with us. When there is no doubt of the figurative sense of both these words separately (cf. 653 of our play and O. T. 448), why should there be any difficulty in taking them in such a sense when combined?—V. 1329. ἔχων for ἐμῶν, taken from Pallis, is one of the neatest emendations we have seen for many a day.

The only typographical error we have found is on page 117, where “Blackwall” should be “Blackwell,” *nisi fallimur*.

The discussion of the psychology of Sophocles exhibited in the portrayal of character, and of the change of attitude of the Chorus, shows the clear analysis and fine literary instinct that we always expect to find in any piece of work from Professor Jebb.

Whatsoever differences of view may exist concerning certain readings and interpretations, all students of Sophocles will acknowledge their large indebtedness for this richly furnished edition of the prince of Athenian dramatists, and will eagerly welcome the remaining parts.

M. L. D’OOGHE.